

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

|                                  |   |                                     |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Drubay Hall,                     | ) | Civil Action No.: 2:12-cv-01692-RBH |
|                                  | ) |                                     |
| Plaintiff,                       | ) |                                     |
|                                  | ) |                                     |
| v.                               | ) | <b>ORDER</b>                        |
|                                  | ) |                                     |
| Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting        | ) |                                     |
| Commissioner of Social Security, | ) |                                     |
|                                  | ) |                                     |
| Defendant.                       | ) |                                     |
|                                  | ) |                                     |

Plaintiff Drubay Hall filed this appeal of the final decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security denying Plaintiff's claims for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. This matter is now before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Bruce H. Hendricks, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court affirm the Commissioner's decision.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to

give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’ ”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that the Commissioner’s decision is **AFFIRMED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
\_\_\_\_\_  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge

July 16, 2013  
Florence, South Carolina